

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/653,678	09/02/2003	Michael John Keogh	•	4598		
75	90 09/29/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
Michael John Keoga			NGUYEN, CHAU N			
19 ABINGTON DRIVE PINEHURST, NC 28374			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2831			
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/653,678	KEOGH, MICHAEL	KEOGH, MICHAEL JOHN	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Chau N Nguyen	2831	BU	
Davidal f	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	ress	
A SH THE - Exte after - If th - If NO - Faile Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a rolly within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this combanDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.	
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 A	August 2004.			
2a)⊠		s action is non-final.			
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	•	merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit 	ion of Claims				
6)⊠ 7)□	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>18-34</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 August 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specific and the spe	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob drawing(s) be held in abeyan ction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	R 1.121(d).	
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Apority documents have been tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National S	tage	
Attachmen	• •	-			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-2 	152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/653,678

Art Unit: 2831

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-22 and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi et al. (6,248,446) in view of Fishler et al. (4,404,297).

Kikuchi et al. discloses a dual layer polymer-based, non-halogen protective sheath for cables, comprising an outer solid, non-foamed polymer layer as means for providing mechanical protection, and an inner solid, non-foamed polymer layer as means for providing a layer of flame protection (re claims 18 and 26). Kikuchi et al. does not disclose the outer layer being an intumescing layer including intumescing material so that the outer layer would provide thermal and fire protection. Fishler discloses an intumescent fire retardant composition including inexpensive intumescing material which can be combined with polyolefin to obtain an outstanding fire retardant effect. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the intumescing material, melamine phosphate (col. 4, line 37) (re

Application/Control Number: 10/653,678

Art Unit: 2831

claims 20 and 27), taught by Fishler et al. in the outer layer of Kikuchi et al. to improve the fire retardant properties in the cable.

The modified cable of Kikuchi et al. also discloses the outer layer containing a polypropylene as the base resin (re claim 19), the intumescing material being in about 5 to about 100 parts by weight contained in 100 parts by weight of the polypropylene (see Fishler et al., col. 3, lines 45-50 and col. 4, lines 37-43) (re claims 21 and 28), the outer layer being of a predetermined thickness to provide sufficient thermal protection (re claims 22 and 29), the inner insulating layer being formed of a polypropylene and containing sufficient acid neutralizer which is magnesium hydroxide (re claims 30 and 31), and a metal conductor protected by the dual layer (re claims 25 and 33). Re claim 32, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose a suitable amount of acid neutralizer in the inner layer of Kikuchi et al. to meet the specific use of the resulting wire since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPO 233. Re claim 34, the modified wire of Kikuchi et al. can be used as an automotive wire since it comprises structure and material as claimed.

Application/Control Number: 10/653,678

Art Unit: 2831

3. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi et al. in view of Fishler et al. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Keough et al.

Page 4

Keough et al. discloses a non-halogen sheath for cables, comprising a nonhalogen extrudable composition of (A) a copolymer of ethylene and an unsaturated ester comonomer of a vinyl carboxylate wherein the carboxylate group has 2 to 5 carbon atoms, (B) the copolymer being, optionally, modified with an anhydride of an unsaturated aliphatic diacid having 4 to 10 carbon atoms, (C) the copolymer having an ester content in the range of about 15 to 40% based on the weight of the copolymer and a melt index in the range of about 2 to about 25 g/10 minutes, and for each 100 parts by weight of component (a), about 100 to 250 parts by weight of magnesium hydroxide, coated or uncoated (see the abstract) (re claim 23) and the unsaturated ester comonomer being vinyl acetate (re claim 24). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the composition as taught by Keough et al. for the inner layer of Kikuchi et al. since the composition of Keough et al. is not only a halogen-free composition but also has a reduced flame propagation.

Application/Control Number: 10/653,678 Page 5

Art Unit: 2831

# Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18 and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Summary

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Chau N Nguyen Primary Examiner

Cheungup

Art Unit 2831